	1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
3	WESTERN DIVISION
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
6	Plaintiff,
7	vs. NO. 2:18-CR-20057
8	JARED WEATHERLY,
9	Defendant.
10	
11	
12	
13	SENTENCING HEARING
14	
15	
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN T. FOWLKES, JR., JUDGE
17	
18	MONDAY
19	19TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2018
20	
21	
22	LISA J. MAYO, CRR, RMR
23	OFFICIAL REPORTER FOURTH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING
24	MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103
25	

APPEARANCES Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff: MR. J. WILLIAM CROW U.S. Attorney's Office 167 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Memphis, TN 38103 (901) 544-4231 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant: MR. LEE HOWARD GERALD Law Office of Lee Gerald 619 South Cooper Memphis, TN 38104 (901) 525-8848 

MONDAY

November 19, 2018

The sentencing hearing in this case began on this date, Monday, 19th day of November, at 12:08 p.m., when and where evidence was introduced and proceedings were had as follows:

\_\_\_\_\_

THE COURT: Just for the record, this is United

States versus Jared Weatherly, set today for sentencing. Are
both sides ready to proceed?

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. GERALD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Presentence Report has been prepared. I have reviewed it. There's a sentencing recommendation that I've also reviewed. Both sides have filed position papers, sentencing memoranda. I've reviewed that material as well. There's a plea agreement the parties entered into, and I'll make the final decision about the plea agreement shortly.

As I normally do, I'd like to go through the calculations first so that we get our starting point in place. I don't know that there are any objections that we need to take up. I think there were several things that Defense wanted clarified, but I'll double check with the

parties once we get our starting point in place, and so, I'd like to go ahead and start at this time.

The calculations begin on Page 8 of the

Presentence Report at Paragraph 24. Of course, this is

conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute that long

word, methylenedioxymethamphetamine. The base offense level

because of the quantity of the MDA -- MDMA is placed at 14.

It is a two-level upward adjustment because a firearm was

found I believe in a vehicle that the Defendant had occupied

just prior to the events taking place. That gives us an

adjusted offense level of 16. Assuming the Government makes

motion on behalf of the Defendant with regard to acceptance

of responsibility, there will be a three-level downward

adjustment.

I need to know if the Government is making that motion?

MR. CROW: We are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That gives us a total offense level of 13. We see at Page 10, Paragraph 37 Defendant has no criminal history. It's zero. And so the criminal history category becomes a 1.

Finally, we page over to Page 18, Paragraph 81, base offense -- total offense level of 13, criminal history category of 1, gives rise to a sentencing range of 12 to 18 months. Okay. I need to double check with Probation and

1 make sure that's accurate. 2 PROBATION: Correct, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I need to know if there are any objections and 4 also whether or not the calculations are correct. First, the 5 6 Government? 7 MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor, they are correct. No 8 objections. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 9 10 And the Defense? MR. GERALD: Your Honor, I want to make sure, I 11 12 don't know if the Court planned on talking about the safety valve reduction but he is eligible. The Government doesn't 13 object, and that would change I believe that 12 to 18 months 14 15 if I'm not incorrect to 10 to 16. 16 Is that it, Mr. Grandberry, if I may? 17 PROBATION: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Hold on just a moment. 19 MR. GERALD: It would be 10 to 16 months, Your 20 Honor. And if I could, Your Honor, I'm referring to the 21 addendum. 22 THE COURT: The addendum sets out the safety valve, the top of Page 2, I believe. Assuming the safety 23 24 valve were included, we would end up with a total offense level of 12 and the 10 to 16 months that you made reference 25

to.

MR. GERALD: That is.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GERALD: That would be -- other than that, we have no objections.

THE COURT: All right. And I'm assuming the Government doesn't have any objection to that?

MR. CROW: We do not object, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Before we move on, would the safety valve apply if a firearm was involved?

MR. CROW: That was one of my concerns about this, Your Honor, and I was waiting to see how Probation came down on it.

I think it says if a firearm was possessed then the safety valve does not apply, but I'm happy to go along with however Probation reads that, what it's supposed to mean, whether it means the Defendant personally has to have it or someone else has to have it.

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, if I may, the facts would indicate that the firearm was possessed by Mr. Silas, was never in the possession of Mr. Weatherly, and at the end of the day was thrown into the back seat to the third co-defendant. I can't remember her name. I apologize.

But Mr. Weatherly, per his statement, never possessed -- and per the co-defendants never possessed the

firearm. There's some -- there's some argument that he was not completely aware that the firearm was even in the car until the arrest occurred.

THE COURT: This brings about another question in this case. Government chose not to proceed with 924(c). I think I'm going to need to hear about that because of the facts that are set out in the Presentence Report. If y'all could turn to Page 7.

Paragraph 18 talks about the interview that the officers had with the Defendant. You see the very last sentence on the -- last full sentence and then continuing on to Page 8. "Prior to their arrival at Wendy's, Weatherly spoke to the subject to discuss a price because Silas would not talk with him. The agreed-upon price was \$8 per ecstasy tab. Total of \$800. Weatherly advised that Silas had a firearm between his legs when Weatherly exited the vehicle and entered the undercover officer's vehicle."

I need to inquire of the Government about how we're proceeding in this case.

MR. CROW: Your Honor, is your question as to whether or not -- or why we didn't charge 924(c)?

 $\ensuremath{ \text{THE COURT:}}$  Yes, sir. That's one of the questions.

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then also the safety valve.

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor. I would not have charged 924(c) in this case against Mr. Weatherly because I do not -- he did not actually have possession of that firearm.

THE COURT: Aiding and abetting, though.

Normally that happens in these cases that I've seen in other federal prosecutions.

MR. CROW: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: He knew about it. He was the one negotiating the offense, went there with the undercover. So how can we -- how can we not go with 924(c), and because he did not possess it, how can we go with the two-level upward adjustment for presence of the firearm?

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor. I understand.

I did not think the proof was there against Mr. Weatherly. I did charge Mr. Silas with the 924(c) in this case. I thought that was warranted. Yeah. I did not think the Government could prove the charge or I would have included it.

As to the safety valve issue, the agreement is that I would not object if Probation found it to be applicable. I think they're finding to be applicable in this case so I'm not going to object, but I do understand the Court's concern with the firearm being present. That was my major concern as well entering into that agreement as to

whether or not they were going to consider that to be -- you know, whether the firearm was possessed because it just says was possessed. I don't think it says who has to possess it. So that's where we are.

THE COURT: Mr. Gerald, anything?

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, I recall -- and I apologize; I can't locate it right now, but I recall the statement or something in the discovery that Mr. Weatherly prior to them arriving on the scene had advised Mr. Silas, don't bring that gun or something along those lines, discouraged him from bringing the gun; and up until the time that he stepped out of the car to meet with the undercover officer, it was Mr. Weatherly's belief up until that very moment that Mr. Silas did not bring the firearm. So I just can't find that statement in the facts.

THE COURT: Well, we'll be in recess and give you an opportunity to find it because I haven't decided how we're proceeding today.

MR. GERALD: Very well.

THE COURT: This is another situation where a white defendant appears to have been treated differently than African-Americans, and I'm concerned about how we're proceeding in this case. The more serious offense was not charged, whereas similar facts I believe have been charged with African-Americans; and then when there's small

quantities of controlled substance 924(c) is charged and sometimes the Government agrees to drop the drug charges, and the individual ends up with a 60-month sentence.

So I'm not sure how we're going to proceed with this case, whether I can accept the plea agreement, and whether we need to set the plea aside and move forward.

We'll be in recess.

THE CLERK: Court stands in recess.

THE COURT: Let me know when y'all are ready.

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor.

(Brief Recess.)

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Gerald?

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, just to start out, you had requested that if I found this paperwork, what I actually was remembering was -- and I'll pass that to the Court -- is the affidavit that Mr. Weatherly submitted to the Government and Probation as his role in the offense and so forth in relation to the safety valve in which he said toward the end there, Your Honor, that he had discouraged Mr. Silas from bringing the gun and actually had thought that he had not brought the gun until the very last minute.

THE COURT: When was this affidavit given?

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, I believe Mr. Weatherly

signed that affidavit a few days ago, didn't he?

The way it worked was he was in Texas, he

e-mailed me an e-mail, and then that was a while back with that statement. And then when he was transported into Memphis under the marshals' care, I went and met with him in Mason, printed out the e-mail in that form and he signed it.

So the affidavit was signed just last week or earlier -- yeah, last week -- but would have actually been written a good while back, and I can give you the exact date if you want me to look on my phone as to when I received the e-mail.

Your Honor, that e-mail was received by me from Mr. Weatherly on October 14th of this year.

**THE COURT:** From Mr. Weatherly?

MR. GERALD: That's correct.

I asked him to submit an affidavit or a statement of his role in the offense for purposes of the request for the safety valve.

THE COURT: Mr. Crow?

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor.

First, I want to apologize to the Court if it's ever appeared that I've -- I or anyone in our office have prosecuted cases on anything but a race-neutral basis. It's my policy to charge these cases when we think we can prove it. I've charged white people and black people with minimum sentences, some in your court.

In fact, William Smith is an individual who you

sentenced probably six months ago. He was charged with 924(c) and methamphetamine, and we ended up getting -- he ended up getting 96 months, which was what the Government's recommendation was in that case. So I've never viewed it that black people should get more than white people or vice versa. Five years is a long time for anyone to get, and it's a -- I think it would be inappropriate and unprofessional to charge people with something that I don't think I can prove.

In this case in particular, this defendant has two co-defendants, Tiffany Tekle and Mario Silas. Mario Silas is the only one I charged with 924(c). Tiffany Tekle is also African-American. I did not charge her. I thought about it but at the end of the day I can't prove it. And she was actually found with the gun in her hand or behind her when the police went in, arrested everyone. So I would say she's even more culpable than this defendant who only saw the firearm.

Same thing with Mario Silas's companion case. He was charged together with Kenny Fox and Jonathan Shelton.

That's not this case, but I think it's one number different under the case numbers. It's 56 and 57 are his two companion cases.

They're both African-Americans. They're both found with small amounts of drugs in a car in that case. I didn't charge anybody with a 924(c) because I don't think I

could prove it.

So yeah, anyway, again, I apologize to the Court if you've ever thought that I or anyone in our office is taking race into account in what we charge because that's just not the truth.

THE COURT: Mr. Crow, I know it's a serious question that I bring up. We have an individual here who was involved in the drug deal, and I understand the statement that he gave just a couple of weeks ago, the affidavit, but it still doesn't cure the problem that's in the statement of facts in Paragraph 18. When he got out of the car to do the drug deal, the co-defendant who got charged with the 924(c) had the gun between his legs. How do you charge -- for the same drug offense, how do you charge one person and not the other? How do you charge the person sitting in the car and not the person who does the deal?

I understand you don't feel you had enough proof to even proceed on aiders and abetters, but it's a difficult question for me, I'll tell you. You know, I don't like accusing -- I'm not accusing anyone, but this is not the first time that we've had this conversation even. I had a similar conversation with Ms. Parks last week or the week before last.

All right. We're going to go ahead and proceed.

I'll hear the recommendations from everyone, but as I always

do, I'll make an independent decision about what the sentence should be in this case.

You're remaining with your no objection to the safety valve?

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, that's just a recommendation --

THE COURT: In light of the fact he says the co-defendant had the gun between his legs when he gets out of the car to do the deal?

MR. CROW: Your Honor, it's just my job to recommend. I think if you don't want to give him the safety valve that's certainly in your power to do that, Judge.

THE COURT: You also have to answer my questions about the decisions that you make and your thought process behind the decision.

MR. CROW: Yes, Judge.

So I did struggle with that because it says with a firearm was possessed I think is again what the guidelines say. I've not gotten any clear guidance anywhere I can find where it says who has to possess the firearm. I was hoping Probation would, you know, let us know one way or the another what they thought about it. I think they're saying he should still get the safety valve despite that fact, and that's who I was trying to rely on.

Maybe they're wrong. Maybe I'm wrong, and I know

you'll tell me if I am.

THE COURT: As you always know the Court of Appeals is looking over my shoulder right now. So let me hear from Probation.

PROBATION: Yes, Your Honor. I believe that when we consider the safety valve and looked at 5C1.2(a)(2), we were looking primarily at the plain language of the guidelines which says the defendant did not use violence or threats of violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon in connection with the offense.

So in the plain language of it was -- is just that the Defendant did not do that. So I believe that's what the probation officer was looking at.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Well, I'm going to deny the safety valve in this case. I just think it's totally inappropriate given the facts that have not been objected to in the Presentence Report. I mean, there are certain clarifications that were presented by the Defense, but as far as Paragraph 18 is concerned, there were no objections and based upon that, I disagree with Probation as well as the Government and the Defense. It is inappropriate to the apply the safety valve in this case in light of the fact that it was a drug deal and the Defendant knew that the firearm was present in a co-defendant's possession when he exited the vehicle and

entered the undercover officer's vehicle as is set out in Paragraph 8. There was a firearm that was used in this, and it's clear to this Court an aider and abetter situation.

I'm still not convinced about the decision that the Government makes, but I mean that's the Government's decision as far as prosecutorial discretion is concerned. As far as safety valve is concerned, I am not going to apply that. And so that means that as we move forward and consider the 3553 factors, the guidelines are as I originally stated, total offense level of 13.

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, may I interrupt? I apologize.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. GERALD: I'd like to for a second make sure

I'm clear on the basis of the Court's rejection of the safety

valve. Is it based on the fact that Mr. Weatherly saw the

qun immediately before exiting the vehicle?

I would respectfully agree with Probation,

Mr. Grandberry, that there's no indication in the facts that

Mr. Weatherly possessed the firearm, ever had it in his

possession or really near him and that the language of 5C1.2

Subsection 2 does specifically say the defendant did not -
and I -- use credible violence or credible threats of

violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon. I

think that's a different standard than aiding and abetting,

and I would ask the Court to reconsider that.

The other thing, before the Court completely rejects the safety valve, I would like to discuss with Mr. Weatherly if -- and if the Court will allow it, to hear from Mr. Weatherly, as to his knowledge of the firearm. I would argue that if he's getting ready to get out of a car and he sees the car for the first time, I don't know if that actually is aiding and abetting if he's discouraging Mr. Silas from bringing the firearm in the first place into his belief until that very moment did not believe that there was a firearm in the car. And I don't know if that's -- if Mr. Weatherly testified to that under oath if that would affect the Court's decision.

And I will say that the -- and I had this conversation with Mr. Grandberry prior to court -- that the safety valve only really makes a difference of one offense level because of the way the acceptance works. He only gets two points for acceptance with the application of the safety valve as opposed to three points if there is no safety valve. So it really only makes a one-level difference.

I would just ask the Court how you wish me to proceed, if you'd like me to ask Mr. Weatherly to take the stand and testify to that; and I want to be clear as to the basis of the rejection of the safety valve.

THE COURT: I think I've been pretty clear on the

basis of rejecting the safety valve. Under the law, 1 2 individuals can possess items, firearms, in more than one 3 way: Actual possession and constructive possession. I don't know that the guideline goes into that for the safety valve. 4 Many a case has proceeded and the law has proceeded that 5 6 there are different ways to possess. 7 Obviously this was not actual possession. 8 I -- it's clear in the record, at least the way it is to me right now, that there was constructive possession, and that 9 10 it was possessed in furtherance of a drug-trafficking 11 offense. 12 Now you can make your record if you want to 13 present proof, your client's testimony, things of that 14 nature. MR. GERALD: Well, I think in that regard the 15 16 submission of -- if we can admit that affidavit as Exhibit 1. 17 THE COURT: We'll go ahead and receive it as 18 Exhibit 1. 19 MR. GERALD: Then that would probably cover any 20 testimony Mr. Weatherly would present. 21 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 22 MR. GERALD: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 24 marked as Exhibit Number 1.)

THE COURT: We'll go ahead and receive it as

25

Exhibit Number 1. Anything further?

MR. GERALD: Not on that topic, Your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead and proceed with the consideration of the 3553 factors.

First the Government?

MR. CROW: Yes, Your Honor. As the Court has noted numerous times already today this was a very serious offense. Any time you sell felony amounts of any drug, especially something like MDMA, it's a serious offense; and I know the Court obviously recognizes that, especially when there are firearms present, whether or not he possessed them. I mean, that obviously does change the severity of how serious it is. But it's serious regardless if you're selling drugs when there's guns around.

I have to recognize this Defendant has no criminal history. I also recognize he's probably a drug addict, and that may have led to many of the decisions he's made here. Obviously it does not excuse them, and I'm certainly not asking the Court to do that, but I think it's something the Court should consider.

Most concerning to me beyond just the fact that he sold drugs is in Paragraph Number 7 of the Presentence Report, in which he was supposed to be providing a urine sample and it was discovered that the Defendant had a plastic

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pouch full of urine and wrapped in a hand warmer pad. device was taped to the Defendant's abdomen area and a tube and nozzle were attached to the device. That goes above and beyond just having a drug problem. That shows an attempt to It also shows, you know -- and not just deceive Probation but deceive you too, Judge, because you're the one who is going to get to see this eventually. So that concerns me more than just about anything else in this Presentence Report, and for that reason, I would strongly recommend that he not receive probation or time served, that he in fact receive a guideline sentence. I think 12 months, the low end of the quidelines, given his criminal history is enough that will hopefully deter this Defendant from committing future misconduct and hopefully stop doing drugs because that seems to be the basis of many of his problems. So 12 months is what we're asking for Your Honor that is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Let me hear from the Defense, Mr. Gerald.

MR. GERALD: I agree with the Government and Mr. Crow that Mr. Weatherly is a drug addict, and if you -- if the Court in referring to Presentence Report Paragraph 3 through 15 are all about Mr. Weatherly's drug addiction, drug use, drug rehabilitation, actions of a drug addict, arrest for violations, going all the way to Paragraph 12.

He was living in hotels because his wife who is present in the courtroom had kicked him out of the house. He's a drug addict, and his -- and he needs drug rehabilitation. He doesn't necessarily need vocational training. He doesn't need -- he's got his GED, but he needs drug rehab, and he needs the motivation -- and he would tell you that he needs the motivation to go to drug rehab. He needs something over his head like this court, the threat of jail, to convince him that he needs rehab; but it's not just drug rehab that he needs. He also needs mental health counseling. That's Paragraph 44 of the Presentence Report

He needs help. Otherwise we're going to see him back, and I believe and his family believes that if he gets that help we won't see him back.

He made a mistake, but the mistake was based on his addiction, and it's not an excuse but it is an explanation. I think that the Court -- a 12-month sentence is more than necessary, more than needed. The only purpose

jail -- he's not going to be in custody long enough to get into the RDAP, the residential drug program. He's got essentially, I believe, about two months credit. He's got 30 days in since his previous arrest for pretrial violations, and he had somewhere around 19 days. So he's got about a month and a half time credit, maybe a little more.

I'm not sure what he's going to get done in jail in terms of rehabilitation and anything to help us all assure he becomes a productive member of our community given the short timeframe that he's looking at, at least I hope. I'm not sure where the Court's going.

But in my humble opinion, jail serves one purpose and that is in this case deterrence, and that is a valid purpose under the guidelines under 3553. However, in this case, I would ask the Court to consider because he was prior to -- when the safety valve was -- he was eligible -- I'm not sure he is anymore. He is. He's a level 13 now. So he is eligible for split confinement.

I would ask the Court to consider a split confinement sentence, but something that he would be eligible for -- I believe Mr. Grandberry -- six months. Six months of custody followed by six months of home detention.

I don't believe home detention is the answer here. I believe that what he needs is a supervised release violation -- supervised release condition that would mandate

he complete an inpatient drug rehabilitation and counseling, psychological counseling to help him get on track and hopefully stay on track.

I would ask the Court to consider a six-month sentence or something with that being the low end, but something in that neighborhood, followed by a period of supervised release with a mandated condition of inpatient treatment. That's what I'm asking the Court to do.

I too understand the Court's concerns about the sentencing issues with African-American defendants versus white defendants. I think there's a general consensus in the country that things are wrong. I think Congress is taking some of that up now, and they are looking at it specifically in the unfair, if you will, sentencing impact on our minority communities, and I agree with that wholeheartedly.

I don't believe that Mr. Weatherly is someone who deserves, given his role in this offense, given his criminal history, and given the addiction issues as someone who deserves an upward variance or doesn't deserve a downward variance at some sort. I think he needs drug rehabilitation.

I know his wife and his parents are here, and I know they would like to briefly address the Court as to Mr. Weatherly in terms of his character also whenever the Court's ready.

THE COURT: I'm ready now. Why don't you bring

them forward. Mr. Weatherly, have a seat over here.

MR. GERALD: Is up here okay with the Court?

THE COURT: Okay. I'd like to place you under oath and then I'm happy to hear from you.

(Ms. Heydari sworn in.)

THE COURT: If you would please, state your name for the record, please, spell it, and I'm happy to hear from.

MS. HEYDARI: Sarah Heydari, S-A-R-A-H,

9 H-E-Y-D-A-R-I.

As far as this new thing about the gun, I suppose, just -- Jared really values life probably more than I've ever met anyone really value life, and I mean, he wouldn't even kill a snake. I had to. And I promise, he's just a wonderful person. He's been absolutely amazing to my little girl. She loves him. And I know that like everything that's -- you know, he has had to endure along with anyone that comes in and out of these doors, you know, I think they just need some sort of rehab of some kind.

I know that like he's just -- there is a chance if he goes to prison he's just going to come back. I do believe that. And I do believe that with the proper mental treatment and help, I think he would be a wonderful person or a better person and serve his community. I think he could be a very valuable asset.

And, I mean, he's extremely smart. I think he

just needs a little more guidance and just the tools that I 1 2 don't think, you know, prison can provide him, and that's 3 with any person dealing with some sort of addiction of any kind. You can't just -- if it's an option to give him rehab, 4 please, I would -- I really need him to be able to stay on 5 6 the right track, and I don't think prison is going to keep 7 him from doing that. It's going to keep him just going off. 8 So that's really all I have to say. THE COURT: All right. Thank you for coming down 9 10 today. I really appreciate it. 11 MR. GERALD: If I could have a quick second. 12 THE COURT: Come forward. If you would please --13 again, I'd like to place you under oath and then get your 14 name on the record. So if you would please raise your right 15 hand. 16 (Ms. Weatherly sworn in.) 17 THE COURT: You need to speak just a little 18 louder. 19 I'm sorry. MS. WEATHERLY: 20 THE COURT: If you could please state your name 21 for the record, please, and spell your name. 22 THE WITNESS: It's Lisa Weatherly, 23 W-E-A-T-H-E-R-L-Y. I realize that my son has pled guilty to the 24 charge of conspiracy to distribute a controlled substance and 25

this is a serious crime. I just wanted to mention a few things that my son has gone through in his life that most people couldn't deal with.

testimony.

Between the ages of 24 and 30, he lost a baby girl at two and a half months, and a couple of years later

is too much for anyone to wrap their head around, and Jared suffered from a lot of depression and anxiety and panic attacks since that time, and it's just my hope that his sentence will include some type of mental health evaluation and they can figure out what treatment he needs to cope with life and everything that he's been through in a more positive manner, and I just hope the Court will consider all this when sentencing him. And we love and support our son and we thank you for your time.

THE COURT:

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you, Ms. Weatherly.

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, that would conclude any

MR. GERALD: I would also add -- and one thing I

forgot to tell -- advise the Court is that upon his arrest Mr. Weatherly immediately waived his Miranda rights and gave a full inculpatory statement. So he has been -- he has accepted responsibility from the initial arrest all the way to today.

I have nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Weatherly, as I told you before, you do have the right to make a statement today. It is your hearing today. You don't have to if you don't want to, but if there's something you want to say, something that will help me in the decision I'm about to make, I'm happy to hear from you.

If you do want to make a statement, I need to place you under oath. Anything you want to say?

MR. GERALD: Your Honor, he's written out a statement, and he would like me to read it if that's okay for the Court. He's a nervous wreck.

THE COURT: That's fine. You can go ahead, Mr. Gerald.

MR. GERALD: I'm going to --

He would state, I've been clean the longest period of my adult life. What is now clear to me I've just been afraid for a long time to live. I've been stuck in my past for too long and now I have this overwhelming clarity.

I've been blessed in many ways -- so many ways that I could not even see all because of fear. I have the most loving family anyone could ask for. I have the most amazing, beautiful wife any man could ever imagine, the cutest and smartest stepdaughter and a mother I put through hell and has at no point ever doubted who I really am and always believed in me, even long after I had given up on myself.

But most of all I want to prove to myself and this Court and my family that all this is the past and that this man standing here today is and will continue to reach his potential in a positive way.

So he's basically -- and then -- we discussed and he would also add that he would like some type of rehab regardless of when that occurs, and that as an addict he's of no benefit to his family whatsoever.

Is that accurate?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. GERALD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Crow, anything further?

MR. CROW: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take it under advisement. I'll consider everything that's been presented to me today. I'll make the final decision when we

29 come back. Mr. Herrin, I need for you to find a date 1 2 hopefully some time in December, but if not, we may need to go over into January. 3 Tuesday, December 18th, 11:00 a.m. 4 THE CLERK: 5 THE COURT: How does that sound? 6 MR. CROW: That should be fine, Your Honor. 7 MR. GERALD: That sounds good. I have a trial set in Jackson, but I anticipate my client pleading guilty 8 9 tomorrow. So, if that changes, I will notify the Court 10 immediately. 11 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 12 Otherwise I'll see everybody back on that date and I'll make the final decision at that time. 13 14 MR. GERALD: And, I'm sorry, what was the time of 15 day? 16 THE CLERK: 11:00 a.m. 17 THE COURT: Let's go ahead and adjourn court. 18 (Adjournment.) 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

CERTIFICATE I, LISA J. MAYO, do hereby certify that the foregoing 30 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill and abilities, a true and accurate transcript from my stenotype notes of the SENTENCING HEARING on 29th day of November, 2018, in the matter of: United States of America VS. JARED WEATHERLY Dated this 11.29.18. S/Lisa J. Mayo LISA J. MAYO, LCR, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of Tennessee